UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,791	11/19/2003	Hiroaki Kubo	JP920020167US1	6146

7590 07/09/2008

DOUGLAS W. CAMERON
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
IBM Corporation
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER	
WERNER, DAVID N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,791	KUBO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David N. Werner	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 October 2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action for US Patent Application 10/716,791 is in response to communications filed 26 March 2008, in reply to the Telephonic Interview of 25 March 2008, and communications filed 10 March 2008, in reply to the Non-Final Rejection of 10 December 2007. Currently, claims 1-7 are pending.

2. In the previous Office action, claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US Patent 6,233,253 B1 (Settle et al.) in view of US Patent 6,297,794 B1 (Tsubouchi et al.). Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Settle et al. in view of Tsubouchi et al. in view of US Patent 5,671,260 A (Yamauchi et al.).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the inclusion of the word "digitized" in claim 1 and claim 3 precludes the application of Yamauchi as prior art, since Yamauchi acts on a analog/digital converter. However, this converter would perform the step of producing "digitized" video. As shown in figure 1 of the specification of the present invention, video decoder 5 produces "digitized" video from an analog source. Since the output from converter 5 of Yamauchi et al. has not yet been processed through digital signal processor 9, which performs "various digital processing such as shuffling, compression, error correction, and modulation" (column 1: lines 49-61), the output of converter 5 is

the claimed "plurality of lines of data with a plurality of horizontal synchronization periods, one horizontal synchronizing period following each line of data". Therefore, Yamauchi et al. remains valid prior art. As discussed in the interview of 28 March 2008, since Yamauchi was relied on for a similar limitation in claims 3-5, but not claims 1,2, 6, and 7 in the 10 December 2007 Office action, Yamauchi will be extended as prior art to all claims, in view of the amendment of 10 March 2008.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on 26 November 2002. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 2002-342268 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,233,253 B1 (Settle et al.) in view of US Patent 6,297,794 B1 (Tsubouchi et al.), of which corresponding Japanese Patent Application Publication 10-116,064 A was cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of 01 March 2007, and in view of US

Patent 5,671,260 A (Yamauchi et al.). Claims 1, 6, and 7 of the present invention are co-extensive in scope with claim 1 as a hardware embodiment, claim 6 as a method, and claim 7 as a software embodiment. Settle et al. teaches a format conversion system that multiplexes video data from multiple sources into one data format for transmission (abstract). Regarding the "header generation device" of apparatus claim 1, packetizers 18 in Settle et al. add MPEG transport headers to the data from the video sources (column 4: lines 47-49). Regarding the step of "generating a packet header" in method claim 6, the packetizers perform formatting steps 214 and 245, which add packet headers to video data in the method shown in figure 1 of Settle et al. (column 3: lines 23-29, 50-52). Regarding the step of "generating the packet header" in software claim 7, the packetizing method may be implemented on a computer (column 4: lines 26-30). Regarding the "selection of a predetermined amount of video data of said memory as a payload responsive to the packet header" in claims 1, 6, and 7, Settle et al. produces MPEG-2 transport stream packets (column 4: lines 39-42), which were known to have a fixed length of 188 bytes each, comprising the packet header and packet payload data.

Although in the header-generating device of Settle et al. clock references are periodically added to a resultant multiplexed transport stream (column 5: lines 63-66), this information is used to synchronize audio and video data at a decoding step, not at encoding, and so does not correspond with the claimed "synchronizing signal".

Tsubouchi et al. teaches a system with a variety of video devices, including a video capture device (column 8: lines 17-25) and MPEG encoder (column 6: lines 50-

58), which share a dedicated bus for audio/video data. Each device includes an output buffer for outputting data onto the bus (column 2: lines 55-57). This bus includes a ZV control line, on which an enable signal can be transmitted. The control line may be daisy-chained to each device (column 5: lines 27-36), or it may be common to all devices (column 10: lines 13-15). In one embodiment, a pulse generating circuit in each device sends out a pulse on the control line to disable other devices and free up the A/V bus for data transmission (column 11: lines 32-58). Then, the enable signal corresponds with the claimed "synchronizing signal". The setup is pulse-width modulated, with each pulse generating circuit producing a pulse of a different width (column 11: lines 10-32). Each device also includes a flip-flop that stores the enable/disable state for the device. A particular device can only use the video when its flip-flop is set to enable (column 10: lines 41-56). Then, until a pulse from a different device is detected, resetting the flip-flop, a device may be free to output video to the bus. Then, these flip-flops correspond with the claimed "synchronous timing detector" in claim 1, and the resetting of a flip-flop corresponds with the claimed "detecting a synchronization signal".

Settle et al. discloses a majority of the claimed invention except for generating packetized video in response to a synchronization signal. Tsubouchi et al. teaches that it was known to store video in a buffer, and only read out from the buffer in response to an enable signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to store video from a source into a buffer and only output from the buffer after detecting an enable signal, as taught by Tsubouchi et al., since Tsubouchi et al. states

in column 2: lines 49-50 that such a modification would prevent collision between video data streams from multiple sources.

However, the combination of Settle et al. alone and Tsubouchi et al. the enable pulse in Tsubouchi et al. for reading video data from the buffer is not a horizontal synchronization signal, operating on digitized video data comprising a plurality of data lines, each followed by a horizontal synchronization period.

Yamauchi et al. teaches a digital signal processing apparatus that includes a Phase Locked Loop (PLL) that produces a clock signal locked to the horizontal synchronization signal included with the video input (abstract). Regarding claims 1, 6, and 7, Synchronization signal 2 extracts an HSYNC and VSYNC signal from input video signal Sv (column 4: lines 44-50), and control generator 12 extracts the HSYNC signal to produce reference signal Sf1 (column 2: lines 51-56). PLL 13 generates a clock signal Sc1 from reference signal Sf1 (column 4: lines 61-63), and A/D converter 5 samples video signal Sv with respect to the clock signal Sc1, producing digital video Svc (column 5: lines 27-32), comprising lines of digital video synchronized to horizontal and vertical synchronization signals (column 8: lines 1-49). (Compression of the digital video, commonly known to include the steps of converting from a video line format to a transform format of two-dimensional blocks of data, does not occur at this stage.) Digital video Svc is stored into memory 6 based on write signal Sw, which is based on the HSYNC and VSYNC signals from the original video (column 5: lines 24-26). Then, the video memory is only written to when video data is transmitted in signal Sv, such as columns 123–824 in a given line in the NTSC standard (column 5: lines 19-24).

Settle et al., in combination with Tsubouchi et al., disclose the claimed invention except for digitizing video according to a horizontal synchronization signal. Yamauchi et al. teaches that it was known to sample video based on a horizontal synchronization signal, as set forth in column 5: lines 6-39. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to synchronize a digital video transcoder to HSYNC as taught by Yamauchi et al., since Yamauchi et al. states in column 8: lines 1-4 that such a modification would ensure that only relevant video data is encoded and not non-video data transmitted in a horizontal blanking interval, regardless of the variability of this interval.

Regarding claim 2, as mentioned previously, Settle et al. produces MPEG-2 transport stream packets (column 4: lines 39-42). As was known in the art at the time of the invention, an MPEG-2 transport stream packet must be 188 bytes long, and consists of a header and a payload. If the header is given an extended length, then the subsequent payload is shortened so that the total length of the header and the payload remains at 188 bytes. As shown in ISO/IEC 1318-1 (MPEG-2), a transport stream includes an "adaptation field length" field that indicates the length, in bytes, of the extended header (pp. 21). Therefore, since Settle et al. is an MPEG-2 transport stream encoder, it is inherent that it includes counters for counting packet header length and total packet length, and a selector to output payload data after a packet header has concluded, to produce valid MPEG-2 transport stream packets.

Regarding claim 3, as discussed at length above, Settle et al. outputs video data as MPEG-2 transport stream packets. In addition, video capture 31 of Tsubouchi et al. contains an output buffer for outputting video to a dedicated bus (column 2: lines 55-57), corresponding with the FIFO memory.

Regarding the "data valid signal" of claim 4, in Yamauchi et al., video memory write signal Sw is only enabled during the period in a particular line in a video when converted video signal Svc corresponds to effective video data (column 5: lines 17-26). Then, only valid video data is transmitted.

Regarding the memory reset in claim 5, for each given line in an NTSC format, writing signal Sw controls a memory to not read data for the first 122 cycles of clock Sc1 produced from the horizontal synchronization signal, then to write data for the next 720 clock cycles, and to release data, thus clearing and resetting the memory for the next line, for the last 16 clock cycles (column 8: lines 1-15).

Yamauchi discloses the claimed invention except for producing a data valid signal based on a horizontal synchronization signal from a memory write controller instead of a packet header length counter. However, the "data valid signal" in claims 4 and 5 is considered equivalent under the Doctrine of Equivalents to the "writing signal" in Yamauchi et al., since in both the present invention and in Yamauchi et al., the signal performs the same function (controlling a memory storing a video signal), in substantially the same way (in response to a horizontal synchronization signal), to

produce substantially the same result (outputting only valid data not in the horizontal blanking interval). See *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products*, 339 U.S. 605, 85 USPQ 328 (1950).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent 5,831,690 A (Lyons et al.) teaches a processor that synchronizes MPEG packet data to a field or frame synchronizing signal, as shown in figures 5-7. US Patent 6,377,309 B1 (Ito et al.) teaches an image processing system that multiplexes MPEG-4 datastreams and MPEG-2 datastreams. US Patent 6,400,767 B1 (Nuber et al.) teaches a system that inputs data ordinarily contained in a horizontal blanking interval into a digital television data stream. US Patent Application Publication 2001/0050924 A1 (Herrmann et al.) teaches a method of transporting MPEG-4 data as payloads in MPEG-2 data packets. US Patent Application Publication 2002/0136241 A1 (Pasqualino et al.) teaches a system for transmitting auxiliary data within a horizontal or vertical blanking period of a video stream.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David N. Werner whose telephone number is (571)272-9662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri, can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. N. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Mehrdad Dastouri/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621